UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE          | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/602,908  | 06/24/2003           | Peter S. Vosbikian   | QUK-2               | 2166             |
| 26689 7590 01/12/2007<br>WILDMAN HARROLD ALLEN & DIXON<br>225 WEST WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 2800 |                      |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|   |                      |                      | WALCZAK, DAVID J    |                  |
| CHICAGO, IL 60606   |                      |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                      |                      | 3751                | -                |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY   | Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
| 3 MONTHS 01/12/2007   |                      | 01/12/2007           | PAPER               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|  |  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | 10/602,908   | VOSBIKIAN ET AL.   |  |  |  |
|  | Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  |  | David J. Walczak   | 3751   |  |  |  |
| Period fo  | The MAILING DATE of this communication apported to the second section apport.  | pears on the cover sheet w   | ith the correspondence address   |  |  |  |
| VVHIC<br>- Exter<br>after<br>- If NC<br>- Failu<br>Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DISCORDER, FROM THE MAILING DISCORDER OF | ATE OF THIS COMMUNI: 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON. c. cause the application to become A | CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. 8.133) |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 N   | lovember 2006.   |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3)   | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | closed in accordance with the practice under E   | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D  | ). 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |
| Dispositi  | ion of Claims  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)🖂  | Claim(s) 46-50,52-66,68,81-84,86-110 and 11  | 2-114 is/are pending in the  | e application.   |  |  |  |
|  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  | - · · · ·  |  |  |  |  |
| 5)⊠  | Claim(s) 46-50,52-66,68,81-84 and 86-110 is/a  | are allowed.   |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠  | Claim(s) 112-114 is/are rejected.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7)   | Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8)□  | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o  | or election requirement.   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicati  | ion Papers   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)   | The specification is objected to by the Examine  | er.  |  |  |  |  |
| 10)  | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc   | epted or b) objected to  | by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |
|  | Applicant may not request that any objection to the  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct   | tion is required if the drawing  | (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |  |  |
| 11)  | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | caminer. Note the attached   | d Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |  |  |
| Priority u   | under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12)  | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  | priority under 35 U.S.C. §   | \$ 119(a)-(d) or (f).  |  |  |  |
| _  | ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:  | promy amount of order of   | , 110(=) (0) 0. (1).   |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Certified copies of the priority document   | s have been received.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. Certified copies of the priority document   |  | application No.  |  |  |  |
|  | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | application from the International Bureau  |  | · ·  |  |  |  |
| * S  | See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | of the certified copies not  | received.  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachmen  | t(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| _  | e of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview S   | Summary (PTO-413)  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notic   | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s   | s)/Mail Date   |  |  |  |
|  | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date  | 5)  Notice of I  | nformal Patent Application   |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Amendment

It is initially noted that claims 1-45 and 69-80 have been canceled, however, these claims must still be listed in the listing of the claims and currently are not. Any response to this office action should include another list of claims and further include the status of claims 1-45 and 69-80. The Applicant may simply insert "1-45 (canceled)" and "69-80 (canceled)" in the appropriate place on the complete claim list.

#### Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure filed 11/21/06 is objected to because, as discussed in the previous office action, phrases that can be implied, such as "The invention relates" and "the invention" should not be present therein. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 113 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear as to whether or not the "first cleaning member" is intended to be part of the claimed combination, i.e., the language on lines 3-4 seems to indicate that the first cleaning member is not intended to be claimed. However, the

language of lines 5-7 seems to indicate that the first cleaning member is intended to be claimed. Should the Applicant intend to claim the first cleaning member, an antecedent basis for the first cleaning member should be defined. Should the Applicant not intend to claim the first cleaning member, "adapted to be" language should be used when referring thereto.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 112 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalli et al. (hereinafter Lalli) in view of Chen. In regard to claim 112 and 114, Lalli discloses a mop comprised of a handle 12, 13 having upper and lower ends and a portion 20 adapted to hold a fluid, a mop head 135 at the lower end of the handle, a cleaning member 137, an opening (in spray head 110) in communication with the portion 20 of the handle holding the fluid and positioned on the mop head and above a bottom surface of the cleaning member, a first actuator 145 associated with the mop to cause the mop head to compress a portion of the cleaning member and a second actuator 95 adapted to cause the fluid to be released through the opening wherein the second actuator 95 is positioned on the handle above the first actuator (viewing Figure 1, second actuator 95 is positioned above the first actuator 145). Further, the portion of

the handle adapted to hold a fluid further includes an opening (defined by O-ring 51) and "only one valve" 49 within the handle for releasing fluid from the opening (the valve 49 is the only valve that cooperates with the opening) wherein when the valve is in a closed position the valve is adapted to cover the opening and when the valve is in an open position, the valve does not cover the opening. Although the Lalli reference does not disclose an additional cleaning surface in a substantially different plane that the cleaning member, attention is directed to the Chen reference, which discloses another mop assembly wherein a cleaning surface 31 is positioned on the mop head and in a substantially different plane than the cleaning member 29 in order to enable a user to have access to an additional cleaning element. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include such an additional cleaning surface onto the Lalli device in order to enable a user of that device to have ready access to an additional cleaning element.

Claim 113 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirse in view of George and Chen. In regard to claim 113, Hirse discloses a mop comprised of a handle 1, a mop head 5 disposed near a lower end of the handle, a first cleaning member 7 "releasably" secured to the mop head and an actuator 9 associated with the mop to cause the mop head to compress a portion of the cleaning member. Although the Hirse device does not disclose a second cleaning member, attention is directed to the George reference, which discloses another mop wherein a first cleaning member 42, 43 is covered by a second cleaning member 22 (wherein the second cleaning member 22 is secured to the mop head) in order to enable a user to remove a soiled

cleaning member and have ready access to a clean cleaning member. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include such a structure onto the Hirse device in order to enable a user to have ready access to a clean cleaning member. Such a mounting structure for additional cleaning sheets would enable a second cleaning member to be either mounted over the first cleaning member or mounted to the mop head in the absence of the first cleaning member, i.e., such a device would be capable of being used as claimed. Although the Hirse reference does not disclose an additional cleaning surface in a substantially different plane that the cleaning member, attention is directed to the Chen reference. which discloses another mop assembly wherein a cleaning surface 31 is positioned on the mop head and in a substantially different plane than the cleaning member 29 in order to enable a user to have access to an additional cleaning element. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include such an additional cleaning surface onto the Hirse device in order to enable a user of that device to have ready access to an additional cleaning element.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 46-50, 52-66, 68, 81-84 and 86-110 are allowed.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/602,908

Art Unit: 3751

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Walczak whose telephone number is 571-272-4895. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 6:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huson Gregory can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David J. Walczak Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

DJW 1/5/07